

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS  
Edmunds Central School District  
Accountability Review - Monitoring Report 2010-2011**

**Team Members:** Joan Ray, Team Leader, Chris Sargent, Education Specialist and Cindy Kirschman, Transition Specialist

**Dates of On Site Visit:** January 24, 2011

**Date of Report:** April 20, 2011

3 month update due:                      Date Received:

6 month update due:                      Date Received:

9 month update due:                      Date Received:

Closed: March 18, 2011

---

**Program monitoring and evaluation.**

In conjunction with its general supervisory responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Special Education Programs (SEP) of the Office of Educational Services and Support shall monitor agencies, institutions, and organizations responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state, including any obligations imposed on those agencies, institutions, and organizations. The department shall ensure:

(1) That the requirements of this article are carried out;

(2) That each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the state, including each program administered by any other state or local agency, but not including elementary schools and secondary schools for Native American children operated or funded by the Secretary of the Interior:

(a) Is under the general supervision of the persons responsible for educational programs for children with disabilities in the department; and

(b) Meets the educational standards of the state education agency, including the requirements of this article; and

(3) In carrying out this article with respect to homeless children, the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended to January 1, 2007, are met. (Reference- ARSD 24:05:20:18.)

**State monitoring--Quantifiable indicators and priority areas.**

The department shall monitor school districts using quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas, and using such qualitative indicators as are needed to adequately measure performance in those areas:

(1) Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment;

(2) Department exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services as defined in this article and article 24:14; and

(3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:18:02.)

---

**State enforcement -- Determinations.**

On an annual basis, based on local district performance data, information obtained through monitoring visits, and other information available, the department shall determine whether each school district meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA...

Based upon the information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information made available, Special Education Programs of the Office of Educational Services and Support determines if the agency, institution, or organization responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state:

- Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Act;
- Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act'
- Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act; or
- Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:23.04.)

**Deficiency correction procedures.**

The department shall require local education agencies to correct deficiencies in program operations that are identified through monitoring as soon as possible, but not later than one year from written identification of the deficiency. The department shall order

agencies to take corrective actions and to submit a plan for achieving and documenting full compliance. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:20.)

---

## **1. GENERAL SUPERVISION**

**(Current ARSD and Statement of non-compliance: Findings from previous report on September 9, 2004)**

**Out of compliance**

### **24:05:25:04 Evaluation procedures**

School districts shall ensure a child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability and that evaluation procedures include a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional and developmental information about the child, including information provided by parents that may assist in developing the content of the child's IEP.

Through file review, the monitoring team confirms the steering committee's findings in the area of functional evaluation reports. In six of seven files reviewed, functional evaluations were administered but the information was not consistently summarized in a report form and given to parents. There was one speech file that did not have the functional information summarized into a report form. Two additional files lacked a written report summarizing functional skills in the area of academic achievement.

**Follow up: January 24, 2011**

**Finding: No Corrective Action Plan Needed**

## **2. GENERAL SUPERVISION**

**(Current ARSD and Statement of non-compliance: Findings from previous report on September 9, 2004)**

**Out of compliance**

**24:05:30:15. Surrogate parents.** Each school district shall establish procedures for the assignment of a surrogate parent to ensure that the rights of a child are protected if no parent can be identified and the district, after reasonable effort, cannot discover the whereabouts of a parent or if the child is a ward of the state. At a minimum, a district's method for determining whether a child needs a surrogate parent must include the following: The district superintendent or designee shall appoint surrogate parents. The district is responsible for the training and certification of surrogate parents and shall maintain a list of persons who may serve as surrogate parents.

Through interview, the monitoring team determined the district is out of compliance in the area of surrogate parent. The district does not presently have on file a list of persons willing to act as a surrogate parent.

**Follow Up: January 24, 2011**

**Finding: No Corrective Action Plan Needed**

### **3. GENERAL SUPERVISION**

**(Current ARSD and Statement of non-compliance: Findings from previous report on September 9, 2004)**

#### **Out of compliance**

**24:05:27:01.03. Content of individualized education program.** Each student's individualized education program shall include: A statement of the student's present levels of educational performance, how the student's disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general curriculum, a statement of measurable annual goals, including benchmarks or short-term objectives, a statement of how the student's parents will be regularly informed (through such means as periodic report cards), at least as often as parents are informed of their nondisabled student's progress.

Through file review, the monitoring team agrees with the steering committee's findings in the area of IEP content. The IEP teams did not consistently address all areas of IEP content. In two of seven files reviewed, parent input was not documented on the present level of performance. In four of seven files reviewed the team did not adequately document how the student's disability affects his/her progress in the general curriculum. Statements such as "Without 1:1 assistance in helping student with math..." and "continued upgrading of student's adaptive abilities will provide her greater independence ..." does not address how the disability affects the student's progress in the general curriculum.

Through interview, the monitoring team determined the school district reports student progress to parents eight times a year for nondisabled students but reported progress for students with a disability only four times a year. Parents must be informed of their student's progress at least as often as parents are informed of their nondisabled student's progress.

In three of the seven files reviewed, annual goal statements were not measurable. Goal statements such as "Student will improve in math problem solving.", "Student will improve in accepting responsibility for her school behavior.", and "Student will improve in math abstract reasoning and understanding..." are not measurable.

**Follow Up: January 24, 2011**

**Finding: No Corrective Action Plan Needed**

### **FAPE IN THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT**

**Finding: None**

**No Corrective Action Plan Needed**

### **DISPROPORTIONALITY**

**Finding: None**

**No Corrective Action Plan Needed**